

**IN THE CLAIMS:**

Please cancel Claims 1-7,

Please replace the claims with the attached amended claims.

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, dated March 16, 2004, the Examiner states that Claims 1-11 are pending and Claims 1-11 are rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the specification and the claims.

In the Office Action, the specification and claims are objected to for various informalities. The Applicant has amended the specification and claims as the Examiner suggested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Applicant has made amendments to the claims to overcome these rejections and to make the claims more readable. The amendments that have been made to the remaining claims have not been made for any reason relating to patentability in view of the cited prior art references.

The Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-7 without prejudice to the scope of protection which should otherwise be afforded to the remaining claims or to any divisional or continuation applications that may be filed.

With regard to the remaining Claims 8-11, Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by US 5,494,782 (Maenza et al.), or under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by US 6,409,902 (Yang et al.). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of US 5,997,709 (Krinke). Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krinke in View of US 4,537,732 (Ueda et al.). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

During the standard operation for forming a lens sheet, or a die for forming a lens sheet, several dies are made: A reverse pattern master die by a cutting operation, a normal pattern mother die by an electroforming operation,

3

and a reverse pattern stamper die by an electroforming operation. The manufacture of each of these dies is very time consuming.

In the method according to independent Claim 8, a deposition film is formed on a surface of a product, and a stamper die is formed on the deposition film, thus saving several time consuming steps in forming the stamper die.

In the method according to independent Claim 10, the master die is electroplated and the molded product is formed directly from the plated master die. This again saves several time consuming steps that otherwise would have been taken to form the other dies.

None of the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, disclose these step cutting savings. While the references may disclose some aspects of these step savings, a person skilled in the art would not have easily been able to combine the references and arrive at the claimed step saving methods for the specified electroforming process without using impermissible hindsight.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613

August 6, 2004

Date